

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending in this case, Claims 1 and 5 having been amended by the present amendment. In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Goto (U.S. patent 6,829,023) in view of Ishizuka et al. (U.S. patent 6,707,438 herein "Ishizuki").

In light of the renewed ground for rejection, Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention and thereby more clearly patentably define over the cited prior art. To that end, amended Claim 1 clarifies the nature and functionality of the reset signals produced in the claimed a reset signal supply section, stating that different reset signals are supplied to the pixels associated with the main wavelengths of light to be emitted from the luminous elements, each reset signal initializing the potential of the control terminal and correcting the potential of the control terminal to a level suited for the main wavelength of light to be emitted from a corresponding luminous element so as to achieve a luminous balance between the main wavelengths of light to be emitted. Support for this language is found at pages 22-23 of the specification. Similar changes are introduced into Claim 5, but for the case of a single pixel. No new matter has been added.

As explained in Applicants' paper filed Sept. 11, 2006, in Claim 1, the reset signal supply section supplies to the pixels *different reset signals associated with the main wavelengths of light to be emitted from the luminous elements*. With that structure, each reset signal is capable of initializing a control voltage applied from the capacitor to the drive control element into a level equal to the inherent threshold voltage V_{th} of the drive control element, and is capable of correcting the initialized level to a level suited for the main wavelength of light to be emitted from the luminous element. That capability is now

explicitly stated in Claim 1, with the further feature stated that a luminous balance is achieved between the main wavelengths of light to be emitted. This luminous balance capability, although not explicitly stated in Claim 5, is implicit in view of the similar language added to Claim 5 that each reset signal initializing the potential of the control terminal and correcting the potential of the control terminal to a level suited for the main wavelength of light to be emitted from a corresponding luminous element so as to achieve a luminous balance between the main wavelengths of light to be emitted.

As acknowledged in the outstanding Office Action, Goto does not teach a reset signal supply section or the functionality stated in the claims in that regard.

Ishizuka discloses a reset driving method that accelerates the rise time of light emission in luminous elements. As described at column 6, line 65 to column 7, line 16, Ishizuka describes its driving method as follows:

According to such a driving method of the present invention, a subsequent drive line corresponding to capacitive light-emitting elements which should be allowed to emit light during the subsequent scanning period is designated during a reset period in accordance with the input image data. In addition, the third potential is supplied to the subsequent drive line and thereby an offset voltage not greater than the light emission threshold voltage is applied to the capacitive light-emitting elements. Moreover, the drive current and the third potential are made variable depending on the type of the capacitive light-emitting elements. **Consequently, variations in voltages across respective capacitive light-emitting elements for emitting light of colors different from each other can be thereby made equal to each other, the variations being produced by the time the voltages reach each desired voltage during a scanning period.** Thus, the rise characteristic of each of capacitive light-emitting elements that emit light of colors different from each other can be improved. (Emphasis added)

Applicants do not teach or claim making variations in voltages across respective capacitive light-emitting elements for emitting light of different colors equal. On the contrary, Claim states each reset signal initializing the potential of the control terminal and correcting the potential of the control terminal to a level suited for the main wavelength of

light to be emitted from a corresponding luminous element so as to achieve a luminous balance between the main wavelengths of light to be emitted. Claim 5 states similar functionality of a reset signal.

Accordingly, in view of the difference in structure and functionality stated in the amended Claims, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding rejection based on Goto and Ishizuka has been overcome. Withdrawal thereof is therefore respectfully requested.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No. 28,870
Attorney of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)